

REMARKS

In response to the Official Action of 22 September 2006, wherein the Examiner has required a restriction to one invention, Applicant hereby elects to prosecute in the present application the claims of Group I, i.e. claims 1-35. This election is respectfully made with traverse insofar as the Examiner, while providing a basis for restriction between Groups I and III and between Groups II and III, has not provided a basis for restriction as between the claims of Groups I and II. As set forth in MPEP 803, the USPTO has the initial burden for setting forth reasons for restriction.

The processes of Groups I and II are related processes or combination/subcombination wherein, to support a requirement for restriction, the USPTO must show both two-way distinctness and reasons for insisting on restriction (see MPEP 806.05(j) and 806.05(c)). The Examiner respectfully has not shown and cannot show this whereby the requirement for restriction as between these groups is respectfully believed to be improper and should be withdrawn.

Applicant has now amended the claims so that the claims of Group II (claims 36-84) depend, either directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Moreover, Applicant has now amended claims 85-89 so that they are directed to the elected invention. Applicant respectfully submits that all of these claims should be examined in the present application along with the claims of Group I (claims 1-35).

Applicant has completely responded to the requirements in the aforementioned Official Action and now respectfully requests an examination on the merits of at least the elected claims.

Respectfully submitted,

CLIFFORD J. MASS
LADAS & PARRY LLP
26 WEST 61ST STREET
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10023
REG. NO.30,086(212)708-1890